1 1 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 2 FOR THE DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS 3 4 5 UNITED STATES,) CR. NO. 08-10352-NG 6 VS.) COURTROOM NO. 2 7 RICHARD SCHWARTZ, 8) 1 COURTHOUSE WAY DEFENDANT 9) BOSTON, MA 02210 10 11 STATEMENT OF REASONS 12 SENTENCING 13 14 15 APRIL 25, 2011 16 2:28 P.M. 17 18 19 20 21 BEFORE THE HONORABLE NANCY GERTNER 22 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT JUDGE 23 24 VALERIE A. O'HARA 25 OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER

```
2
 1
                           STATEMENT OF REASONS
 2
     APPEARANCES:
3
     For the United States:
4
     Jeffrey Mark Cohen
     United States Attorney's Office
5
     1 Courthouse Way
     Boston, MA 02210
6
7
     For the Defendant:
8
     Bruce A. Singal
     Donoghue, Barrett & Singal, PC
9
     Suite 1320
     One Beacon Street
10
     Boston, MA 02108-3113
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

THE COURT: Okay. Let me start. You can be seated. Let me start with the guidelines. I agree and disagree with the government on this. I agree that it is an abuse of trust under 3B1.3 which would add a two-level increase, but in a sense I disagree with the government with the documents, and the reason that I disagree is that this is an example of, how can I say this delicately, how troubling the guidelines are.

We don't have a rationale for 2L, we don't say here's why we have this provision. We don't have a rationale for it at all, we have the word "document" and the word "six or more documents or passports," and we're all inventing what that means. Eleventh Circuit doesn't make it, we're all inventing that. We don't in any other part of the criminal law invent meanings and rationale like this.

What I do and have done since the beginning is to step back and say something like this tries to capture what the loss table tries to capture or the quantity table, which is someone who is doing a lot of it, and the more you do of the crime, the more culpable you are.

While this fits within the 6 to 24 document/passports technically, this does seem like a one-shot deal, which is this one occasion with respect to these documents. The Commission doesn't tell you why you added 3, why you added 6, why you add 9. If there is any

ambiguity as to whether the letters comprise documents or passports, the traditional rules of criminal law tell me I'm to resolve that ambiguity in favor of the defendant, so that means I'm taking away 3 and adding 2, which means that the total offense level is an 11; is that right?

MR. COHEN: 12 I get, your Honor.

THE COURT: You had 12 with the plus 3, so 12 is 9, and now I'm adding 2 is an 11. I'm adding abuse of trust and not adding the three level of enhancement for documents.

MR. COHEN: Right, you're absolutely right, your Honor, I'm sorry.

THE COURT: Okay. So then the question is that is now 11 and 1, which is 8 to 14, which is right on the probation/non-probation line and would have been before the guidelines.

I appreciate what the government is saying because I do think that someone -- I do think that Mr. Schwartz is in a different position than the other defendants are, but I'm troubled by the fact that this was not his scheme, this was their scheme, he was essentially a functionary in their scheme, he certainly made it possible, but he was a lesser player in their scheme. They were the ones who really stood to gain by it. Whatever the ambiguity of what he received, he certainly didn't gain as much as they stood to gain.

I am profoundly concerned in a three-person or a

four-person case that substantial assistance is given to whomever comes in first in the government's door. I know that the case law allows that, but I have to step back and say does that mean culpability or a really good lawyer that got him in the door first and suddenly everyone else is aligned against this defendant, so while that muddies the relationship between Mr. Schwartz and the other people here, and I am -- what we know about first offenders is that they typically do not recidivate, they typically do not, and certainly someone's whose life is changed like that, that rule about they don't recidivate goes to drug offenders and white color offenders all across the line, so if recidivism is the goal, Mr. Schwartz is not going to recidivate.

If disparity is the goal in terms of unwarranted disparity, on the one hand, he is more culpable because he took his Government position, on the other hand, he's less culpable because it really wasn't his scheme, and I am concerned about his mental health.

While he denies it, there are certainly concerns about his mental health, his ability to cope with his status as a convicted felon. While defendants typically have heightened levels of stress, his seems to be uniquely self-defeating, counterproductive, refusal to sign release forms, provide verification, et cetera.

As a Judge, I see things. One of the difference

between sentencing on a paper and sentencing in court is that you get a sentence of an individual, and it seems to me that there's enough that I have seen that suggests that a probationary sentence with mental health conditions is warranted here.

Mr. Schwartz, would you please stand. So while the guideline calculations are what I've described, on the one hand, called for a more substantial sentence, on the other hand, the factors I've described called for a less substantial sentence. The guidelines are low enough that the difference is the difference between being in jail and not being in jail, which is a substantial difference.

Again, I also recall a line in Gall which was so extraordinary that says being a felon and having being under the supervision of the Government for three years is a substantial penalty, and we have forgotten that.

I'm going to sentence you to three years on probation, a fine of \$10,000, a lump sum payment of \$3,000 within 30 days of the imposition of this sentence. The fine is to be continued to be paid until the full amount has been paid. You're to notify the U.S. Attorney within 30 days of any change of mailing or residence address that occurs while any portion of the crime remains unpaid.

While on probation, you're not to commit another federal, state or local crime. No drug testing. You're to

submit to the collection of a DNA sample. You're to comply with the standard conditions. You're prohibited from possessing a firearm or other dangerous weapon, and, Mr. Schwartz, you're to undergo a psychiatric evaluation and to participate in mental health treatment as directed by probation. You may have to contribute to the costs of that depending upon your ability to pay or the availability of third-party payment.

You're instructed, you're directed to execute any release forms that may be required to authorize disclosure of the psychiatric evaluation to probation, in other words, you'll have a psychiatric evaluation with a psychiatrist, and you are directed to execute the forms that will enable probation to see that and to permit the treatment provided to verify your compliance with any treatment plan implemented.

Again, the \$3,000 within 30 days of the imposition of this sentence. You're prohibited from incurring new credit charges or opening additional lines of credit without probation's approval. You're to provide probation access to the financial information, to any requested financial information which may be shared with the financial litigation unit of the U.S. Attorney's Office. Special assessment of \$100, which shall be due immediately, and you have a right to appeal.

Mr. Schwartz, you can turn a bad situation into a catastrophic one if you don't comply with the conditions of probation. You can turn a difficult situation into an impossible one if you don't comply with the conditions of probation, so and that means all the conditions of probation, otherwise you'll be back again, and given what I've said was the sentence was on the one hand, on the other hand, that balance will tilt in favor of imprisonment if you don't follow these conditions.

So, as I said, you have a right to appeal. Good job on both sides. Thank you very much.

THE CLERK: All rise.

15 .

20 | 21 |